

REMARKS

In the office action of 7/2/09, the Examiner allowed claims 47, 51-53, 58-62, and 64. Claims 45-46, 48-50, 54-57, 63, and 65-66 were rejected under U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite.

In the interview of August 25, 2009, the Applicant and the Examiner discussed the claim language. The Applicant pointed out dependent claims 54 and 55, wherein the operation of step (c) comprises storing a copy of said selected text in a computer memory buffer, or wherein the operation of step (c) comprises searching within said selected text, as examples of operations that can be performed on the selected text without needing to display the text and that are consistent with the other limitations of claim 45, addressing the Examiner's request for more specific examples that demonstrate the claims to be definite. The Applicant and Examiner agreed that the "selected text" of step (b) unambiguously refers to text selected from the original text. In addition, the Applicant and Examiner agreed that processing all components of said selected electronic text unambiguously refers to processing the entire portion of the original text that is selected in step (b).

This discussion addressed all of the specific concerns and grounds for rejection raised in the Final O.A., and the Examiner recommended that the Applicant submit this response so that the rejected claims can now be allowed. The substance of the interview, as recorded by the Examiner, was "Discussed

the 112 issue of the claim. Applicant explained clearly the claimed limitations.
The 112 rejection will be withdrawn.”

CONCLUSION

The Applicant therefore submits this response, in view of the interview discussion. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all claims.

Very Respectfully,

/Philip R. Krause/

Philip R. Krause

Applicant Pro Se

8217 Lochinver Lane
Potomac, MD 20817
(301)-637-7063